DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 689 HE 000 388

By-Monahan, Edward J.; And Others

Decision Making in Higher Education.

American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 11 Sep 68
Note-30p.; Speeches given at the Summer Conference of the American Association for Higher Education, Dallas, Texas, July 1, 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
Descriptors-Activism, *Administrative Policy, Educational Objectives, *Governance, *Higher Education, *Student Behavior, *Teacher Participation, University Administration
Identifiers-*Duff-Berdahl Report

The paper contains shortened versions of 5 addresses given at the 1968 Summer Conference of the American Association for Higher Education. The Duff-Berdahl Report on University Government in Canada recommends a change in the balance of power within the structure of Canadian university government. Its proposals for reform include less board and administrative governance, increased faculty participation, and a closer relationship between Canadian university boards and academic senates. One address reviews the Report and the implementation of some of its recommendations by a majority of Canadian universities, and another address presents the Report's implications for the governance of US colleges and universities. A third address analyzes the causes of student unrest and presents ways, within a proposed university structure, of resolving issues that cause insurrections among students as well as other campus problems. The fourth paper deals with the meaning of governance, behavioral differences of individuals on various campuses, the value conflict between teaching and research, meaningful communication on institution-wide problems, faculty attitudes toward governance, and administrative leadership. The fifth speech presents an analysis of typical students, and their concerns about the lack of responsiveness at their colleges and the need for relevance of higher education to society. (WM)

ED028689

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 003 388

9/11/68

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest
Washington, D. C. 20036

DECISION MAKING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(Shortened versions of addresses and responses given at AAHE Summer Conference, Dallas, Texas, July 1, 1968.)

I

The Duff-Berdahl Report on University Government in Canada: A Review of the Report and Its Implementation

Edward J. Monahan

Implications of the Duff-Berdahl Study for the Governance of American Institutions of Higher Education

Robert F. Drinan, S.J.

Response to Mr. Monahan and Father Drinan

Keith Spalding

II

Presidential Address: A Rendering of Accounts

Lewis B. Mayhew

Response to Mr. Mayhew

Lon Williams

III

Governance and Relevance for Those Over Thirty

Harold L. Hodgkinson

Some Observations About Selected Aspects of American Higher Education Generated by the Campus Governance Program

Stephen B. Plumer

I

THE DUFF-BERDAHL REPORT ON UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT IN CANADA A REVIEW OF THE REPORT AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

by

Edward J. Monahan
Associate Executive Secretary
Canadian Association of University Teachers
Ottawa, Canada

Canada's universities number some sixty and enroll some 270,000 students. The largest, though not comparable in size with American multiversities, are nevertheless urban institutions of 15,000 or more, with sizeable professional schools and research programs. The smallest are liberal arts university colleges enrolling 1,200 students or less. Community colleges, junior colleges, and technical and vocational institutes at the tertiary level are not classified in the same category as universities, and no account of them is taken in this paper.

A large number of Canadian universities were founded by the churches and some still retain a church relationship. Most, however, are now secular. The distinction between public institutions and private ones, so familiar in the United States, is not applicable to Canadian universities, at least not without important qualifications.

All Canadian universities now meet a very large portion of both operating and capital needs from public funds, and in this sense should be classified as public. In six of our ten provinces there are provincial universities and these are the counterpart of your state universities. Ontario has no provincial university but there are fourteen provincially assisted secular universities, each with its own charter. In the Maritime provinces there are similar "private" institutions--some church-related, others not--all with their own charters. All of these universities now receive direct financial support from the government of the province in which they are located. In addition to large provincial grants, there are federal funds as well, but mainly for research.

Present massive support of higher education from public funds is a relatively recent phenomenon in Canada, but it is now well established and generally accepted. On the whole, Canadian universities have enjoyed a tradition of freedom from government interference and there is continuous concern that this be maintained.

The Duff-Berdahl Report on University Government in Canada deals with this variety of institutions and its recommendations are intended to apply to all, with of course the adaptations necessary to take into account individual institutional differences in size, character, and traditions.

The Duff-Berdahl Commission was cosponsored by two associations, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (the analogue of your AAUP) and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, comprising the institutions as corporations and consequently controlled by the chief administrators.

The decision to cosponsor a national study of university government was made in 1962, but its real origins go back to the beginnings of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. Almost from its foundation, some fifteen years ago, this Association, a federation of local faculty associations, took a strong

interest in university government. As an Association executive officer puts it, the Association recognized as one of its basic purposes--

> ...nothing less than the working of a revolution in Canadian university life, through the demand, insistent but never irresponsible, that the idea of the community should displace the idea of the corporation in the organization of our universities; that the central position of the faculty as the permanent citizens of the universities...should be recognized; and that that recognition should be embodied in terms of institutional change, so that in every decision affecting the universities the faculty would be considered, consulted, and involved.

Over a period of years this interest in reforming university government quickened. Local faculty association committees were formed, the issues were debated, and the ground prepared for a change.

Finally, in the fall of 1964, the Commission got under way. Somewhat typically for Canada, it was funded by the Ford Foundation and conducted by a senior commissioner from England, Sir James Duff, former Vice Chancellor of the University of Durham and by a junior commissioner from the United States, Professor Robert Berdahl of San Francisco State College. Their Report was published in March 1966.

The early sixties were a period of explosive growth in Canadian universities, with the steady expansion of existing institutions and the establishment of new ones. However, aside from the activities promoted by local faculty associations and the CAUT, the university government scene was relatively placid. Some of the natives were restless and at one or two institutions a state of open hostility between faculty and board could be said to exist. But for the most part, it was business as usual. Newly founded institutions and those in the process of formation looked to established institutions for direction in developing structures of university governance. As a result, university statutes then being written were almost all carbon copies of those governing older institutions. Student interest in university government had not yet been kindled. There was almost no public interest.

Most Canadian universities were governed on the principle of an assumed separation of powers between the board of governors (or trustees, as you usually call them) and the academic senate. A lay board of governors ostensibly confined its attentions to fiscal matters while giving the necessary legal approval to educational policies coming up to it from a senate which in theory at least represented academic interests.

The lay board was ordinarily put together by a process of self-perpetuation and governmental selection, the former method predominating in the private government-assisted institutions, the latter in the provincial universities. Often there was provision for the election of alumni representatives to the board. In most cases faculty were explicitly excluded from eligibility for board membership.

On the other hand, senates were far from being the exclusive preserve of the teaching staff, most university senates having a very heavy ex officio administrative membership as well as representation from alumni, and other external special interest groups. In theory the senate was in complete charge of academic policy; but because of its large size and polyglot composition, it was likely in practice to defer to the board for leadership in matters of expansion and development and to various committees at the departmental level on curricular matters. In short, apart from its involvement in relatively unimportant matters, the senate was often little more than a rubber stamp.

Because of the great weakness of the senate, some universities developed a general faculty council--a small group, usually selected by their peers--which took on some of the more important duties ordinarily undertaken by the senate. This was an effort to copy certain U.S. modifications of the corporation model of university government by introducing some checks and balances against the exercise of arbitrary authority by board or administration. But this development was far from common.

As a result of the combination of a lay board and a practically powerless senate, the role of the president was a dominant one. The board depended upon strong presidential leadership and the senate was beholden to the president, who normally acted both as its presiding officer and its spokesman on the board. The president was both link and buffer, an unenviable position except for the occasional individual who might see it as an opportunity to divide and rule.

Because of the excessively heavy demands imposed on the president in such a structure, an administrative group was almost certain to grow up around him, well versed in institutional affairs and loyal to their chief executive. Early in the campus visits someone described to Sir James Duff the relationship between president and dean, which he (a former president) took great delight in repeating: "the president is the shepherd of the academic flock and the dean is his crook."

The president was appointed by the board, usually without consultation with the senate, and served an indefinite term. Other administrative officers were appointed by the board upon recommendation from the president and usually served indefinite terms. Some universities had a tradition of consulting faculty prior to the selection of administrators, and at a few (mostly those with religious affiliation) there was provision for limited terms for those holding administrative office. But these were exceptions.

The Duff-Berdahl Report is very critical of this pattern of university government and its recommendations for reform were wide ranging. Although the Report does not propose a radical new system of institutional government, the whole tenor of its recommendations is to produce a change in the balance of power within the structure of university government--away from board and administration and in the direction of faculty--while at the same time bringing board and senate into closer relationship.

Although the Commissioners propose to retain the board of governors as the ultimate legal authority, they recommend a complete reform of the senate so that it may truly become what it ought to be--the supreme academic body in the university.

Boards of governors are criticized as being somewhat too homogeneous in membership, self-perpetuating, and often unwieldy in size. The Report recommends that they be comprised of from 20 to 25 members, but not fewer than 15; that the excessive homogeneity be reduced by having faculty members elected by the academic senate serve on the board--not fewer than three nor more than 25 percent of the total; and that greater provisions be made for the coordination of board and senate activities.

The Report insists that the academic senate should play a strong role in long-term institutional planning as well as in immediate policy making; that it should have power to make recommendations to the board on any matter of interest; and that it should participate in the regular review of the institution's budget.

The Report recommends that the size be reduced to a manageable upper limit of fifty; that all lay representation be removed save for a small minority from the board; and that its work be assisted by an appropriate committee structure.

The Report recommends further that a majority of the senate be faculty members, not administrators, elected by their peers to serve for three-year terms. It suggests that only full and associate professors, or alternatively tenured faculty, should be eligible to serve, except for two or three junior senate seats to be reserved for junior faculty. Election would take place in each school, rather than by the faculty as a whole, in order to insure broad representation of faculty concerns.

No firm recommendation in favor of direct student representation is to be found in the Duff-Berdahl Report. However, the Commissioners recognized as a possibility the desirability of having one or two student members on the senate and stated very firmly their judgment that students should be on committees, including those dealing with educational policies and admissions.

Having introduced the subject of student participation in university government, I should add that the Duff-Berdahl Report recommends against direct student membership on the board of governors. Instead, it proposes that students be represented on the board by a Rector, himself not a student but elected by them. (This is the practice in the Scottish universities.)

Among many recommendations and suggestions in the Duff-Berdahl Report concerning administrative officers, I mention only two and these because in my judgment they are essential to the further democratization of university government. One involves the role of faculty in the selection of administrative officers; the other involves limited terms for administrators.

The Report recommends that faculty be directly involved in the selection of all academic administrators. Departmental chairmen should be nominated by faculty members of the department with final selection by the responsible dean, academic vice president, and president. Deans should be named by the president after consultation with an advisory committee comprised of faculty and administration in equal parts. The president is to be named by the board in consultation with the academic senate.

The Report recommends that departmental chairmen serve three or four years and deans four or five years, each subject to renewal after further consultation with the appropriate agency. Somewhat inconsistently (at least in my own judgment and that of others I have talked to) the Report does not recommend a limited term for the university's chief administrative officer.

I might now mention two somewhat common misapprehensions about the real meaning of the Duff-Berdahl Report, misapprehensions shared by some administrators and lay members of boards. The first is that the Report seeks unduly to restrict the legitimate powers and responsibilities of boards and administration. This is not so, as the text of the Report shows very clearly, although it is true that, in redressing the balance of power in favor of faculty and (to some extent) students, the limits of board and administrative responsibility are spelled out with a rather narrow precision.

The second misapprehension concerns what powers are to be granted to faculty and students. Some misread the Report as recommending only that the faculty and students be given an adequate opportunity to discuss and to debate important institutional issues before decisions are taken, presumably by administration or board.

But make no mistake. The Report is not recommending just an increase in consultation, dialogue, and debate, with faculty and students involved as well as administration and board. It is recommending that faculty and students be given their proper share of control in institutional governance.

What has been the result of the publication of the Duff-Berdahl Report? The Commission had the effect of a catalyst on Canadian universities, stimulating further discussion of university government and crystallizing to the point of action decisions to amend institutional bylaws, charters, and acts. Some universities did not await publication of the Report before proceeding with changes; many others established joint board-faculty committees (some including students as well) to study the Report and make recommendations.

The result has been impressive, with all but a handful of universities introducing some changes in their internal structure. At the time of the study only two or three Canadian universities had elected faculty members on the board. Today some twenty have faculty seated on the board, and more institutions will follow shortly. L'Universite de Montreal has the largest faculty representation, with five on a board of twenty-four, but most have not gone as far as the Report recommends, two faculty members being a common number on boards of fourteen to twenty. However, I am optimistic that experience will reduce this initial timidity and that within a short time only a minority of universities will be without faculty representation on the board of governors.

Although there is to date little general enthusiasm among board members, administration, and faculty for direct student representation, two of the smaller universities have very recently made a place for one student on the board. A few others have introduced the Rector. I expect student pressure for board membership will increase, at least on certain campuses.

Most Canadian universities have made, or are in the process of making, changes in their academic senates. Almost without exception, these changes are in the direction of implementing the appropriate recommendations in the Duff-Berdahl Report. Many universities continue to have a large, somewhat unwieldy senate. But the principle of an elected faculty majority is being accepted everywhere.

The recommendation that eligibility for senate membership be restricted to senior or tenured faculty has been ignored. No university which has made changes in senate membership has accepted this recommendation. At a conference on university government held in Toronto last October, the Commissioners themselves acknowledged a changed judgment on this point. They now favor having all faculty members eligible for election to senate as well as eligible to vote for senators.

Changing times have already outdistanced the Duff-Berdahl recommendations involving students on the senate. Almost half of the universities now provide direct student representation, some institutions having as many as four student senators, and one (Montreal) having six. Almost every Canadian university now gives students membership on at least some senate committees, and an increasing number have students serving on committees at the faculty and department level.

The issue of open meetings has proved very contentious this past year, with newly seated student senators leading a move to have senate meetings open to the public. Also, some of the student senators have been accused of being "Tontos" (the Canadian version of "Uncle Toms") by their more militant SDS colleagues.

The practice of involving faculty in the making of senior administrative appointments, while still relatively uncommon, is increasing. Faculty have been formally involved on committees charged with responsibility for selecting new presidents in at least ten universities during the past twelve months, and this practice is certain to become more common. Procedures for involving faculty in the selection of vice presidents and deans are mixed, sometimes varying from one faculty to another within the same institution, and practice is sometimes in advance of existing statutes. But here too the trend is definitely toward increased involvement of faculty.

Little evidence exists of a strong trend toward limited terms for administrative officers. But there is enough to suggest that this too is beginning to develop. The appointment of deans for limited but renewable terms is now partly in practice at at least a half-dozen of our larger institutions, and is being recommended elsewhere. At the University of Toronto, for example, deans, directors of schools, and department chairmen serve for limited five-year terms subject to renewal; and those who retire from these offices do so without reduction in stipend and with a one-year leave of absence with pay before returning to full-time academic duties.

I do not wish to leave the false impression that the reform of university government in Canada is all but complete, for this is clearly not the case. But the general climate of opinion, both inside and outside the universities, has definitely changed for the better. Criticism of the Report is far more likely to be that it is not sufficiently radical than that it is too radical, reflecting (I think) a significant change in opinion which the work of Duff and Berdahl has itself played a large role in producing.

A common argument one hears now, and it is not without some merit, is that matters of internal governance are no longer of such pressing importance when provincial commissions on university affairs and superboards have begun to develop. In the face of these developments, the argument runs, boards of governors and even academic senates are fast becoming obsolete and we should not be caught focussing attention on the wrong sets of problems.

Without in the last denying the urgency of the need to concern ourselves with these increasingly pressing matters, the shortcoming of such an argument can be illustrated by a recent case involving one of our large, multicampus provincial universities. Last fall, after an election which returned his party to power with a large majority, the premier of the province went on an economy drive. Very soon he announced that he was amazed to discover how much money was going to the university (something he knew all along) and that his government was planning to introduce some changes in the way it dealt with appropriations to the university, changes which would involve treating the university "like any other spending department of the government." Implied in this was a line-by-line examination in the legislature of the budget--a practice unknown in the United States, but which has not as yet been visited upon any university in Canada.

A public outcry, led by the faculty and students, forced the premier to swallow both his proposal and his pride. However, when the legislature met recently and made some revisions in the university act, a previously acceptable clause to place three members of the faculty on the board of governors was missing. This is a lesson which all may well ponder.

Another illustration of the effect of the Duff-Berdahl Report may be given by reference to Simon Fraser University. It shows well how much progress has been made and how uncertain the future is.

Simon Fraser University, located in a mountain suburb of Vancouver, British Columbia, is in some respects a Cinderella on the Canadian academic scene. Begun from nothing, less than five years ago, it now has more than five thousand students. Established by the provincial government, governed by a lay board chaired by a man who doubles as the first chancellor of the university (the same man whose creation the university is), and headed by a distinguished scientist with no prior administrative experience in a university, Simon Fraser has had a series of crises involving faculty and students (at least some faculty and some students) going back almost to the day its doors were first opened. Instant tradition was its claim and continuous crises have been its fate.

Events reached such a state last fall that the faculty association at the University petitioned the Canadian Association of University Teachers to carry out an investigation of the problems besetting the place, particularly matters connected with board-administration-faculty relations. The investigation was made, a report with recommendations was written, but there were no improvements. At the late May meeting of the Council of the CAUT, a motion of censure was passed (the first such motion in the history of the Association) against the president and board of governors--against the president in effect for failing to support the faculty before the board, against the board for continued interference in the academic affairs of the University. The shortcomings of board and administration are characterized by some of the worst details of the type of institutional governance criticized in the Duff-Berdahl Report.

With the public announcement of the censure of Simon Fraser University, a dramatic train of events was set in motion. Within thirty-six hours the board put the president on an indefinite leave of absence and appointed from the faculty a "temporary acting president" until such time as board and faculty could agree on an acting president. The term of office of this board appointee lasted less than forty-eight hours, when he resigned after failing to gain support from the faculty and students. Then the faculty and students, meeting in almost continuous session over a period of three days, elected their own temporary acting president--subsequently approved by the board--and hammered out machinery to bring about a viable academic community at Simon Fraser patterned after the recommendations of the Duff-Berdahl Report, though in some respects going beyond them.

The board has agreed in principle to accept proposed major revisions in the structure of the University and to petition the government of British Columbia to amend the Universities Act to give effect to these reforms. The reforms themselves are intended to give faculty and students a larger share of responsibility in running the academic affairs of the institution and to reduce the area of the board's discretion.

If it is not too early to assess the long-term effect of the Duff-Berdahl Report, it is certainly too early to assess what will happen at Simon Fraser. Yet the two are closely related. Provided the excesses of board interference can be set aside, while at the same time the excesses of the New Left anarchists are avoided, this institution may yet become a model academic community structured along the lines of the Report.

It is, I think, absolutely necessary for our universities (and here I include U.S. ones as well) to clarify and strengthen their own internal structures and procedures if they are to speak coherently and with a concerted voice to governments and the public about their responsibilities and their needs.

No one can deny that our universities today stand in need of a major overhaul, not just improvements in the structure of university government. Our universities in Canada, the United States, and elsewhere must undertake a thorough re-examination of themselves and their activities, an examination which includes their curricula, their methods of instruction, the relation between undergraduate and graduate work, between teaching and research, between free research and contract research, and a reassessment of their role in contemporary society.

Whether or not we in Canada will manage to avoid incidents such as those at Berkeley and Columbia, I do not know. But if we so manage, and I sincerely hope we do, part of the reason will be related to our gradually quickening reform of university government.

I close by repeating some remarks contained in the conclusion of the Duff-Berdahl Report: "Constitutional reform may improve a system of university government to a point, but in the last analysis, its successful functioning will depend more on the good willand mutual trust of the participants." Recognizing that a university is inherently and rightly a battleground of clashing ideas, the Commissioners do not seek a reform which would eliminate disagreements and produce thereby a cozy consensus. What they seek, and what we all should seek, is the development of a structure of institutional governance within which the members of the institution--board, administration, faculty, and students--can play their proper roles in the self-government of an academic community.

I

IMPLICATIONS OF THE DUFF-BERDAHL STUDY FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Robert F. Drinan, S.J.
Dean
Boston College Law School

In a recent rather pleasant conversation with a student not unacquainted with militant action I asked him what he felt was the ultimate objective behind student unrest. His reply was clear and categorical: "We students want to get back the rights that students lost at the University of Paris in the thirteenth century!"

The unarticulated premise of the student was that students, as "customers" of the universities, should have a leading role in deciding the content of the curriculum, the nature of the faculty, and the orientation of the institution. In the event that any militant students can take time out from their demonstrations to document the rights asserted as belonging to students in medieval universities, present-day faculties and trustees will have to surrender the hope that dialogue, joint committees, or confrontation will bridge the generation gap. Everyone--trustees, faculties, and students--will have to engage in some massive research and some thorough analysis in order to discover what, if anything, history can tell us about the best method to govern the contemporary university. Such an historical survey might well reveal that most universities have almost always been poorly governed and indeed that their very nature as the producers of new knowledge and thus the agents of change makes them virtually incapable of being governed by any norms appropriate for less complicated groups within society.

Probably the one principle which would emerge from a study of the history of university governance would be the indispensability of a great amount of flexibility in any university which expects to adapt itself to the changing needs of each generation. This lack of flexibility is perhaps the key weakness in the institutional

structure of the modern American university. This fact was noted by John W. Gardner who said that even excellent institutions run by excellent human beings are "inherently sluggish--not hungry for innovation, not quick to respond to human need, not eager to reshape themselves to meet the challenge of the times."

If there is one thing clear from the Duff-Berdahl study it is the necessity of a university structure which has flexibility or adaptability.

Flexibility can lead to flabbiness but inflexibility can and usually does lead to decay, apathy, or--if enough people care about an institution--to revolution. The current revolution among American students is aimed at the inflexible hierarchy of trustees, president, and deans which has dominated higher education for the past century. That structure is today a patient on the operating table.

Whatever the ultimate result of the "operation," students and an indeterminate number of faculty members will no longer accept policies dictated by trustees whose appointment they probably would have opposed, decisions interpreted by a president they never see, and executed by administrators who not infrequently resolve doubts about policy in favor of the president.

Some faculty members re-create in every generation the asserted ideal of a university which is self-governed by the faculty themselves. It may be that a faculty which is sufficiently competent and adequately organized can govern a university in this way, although at least a nominal role for trustees may be legally necessary. In any event no one can seriously question the fact that faculty members, as members of a learned profession, should have the right to be self-governing in the same way that lawyers and physicians are self-governing. For many reasons--not all of these very clear--faculty members have been unable or unwilling to assert the independence of their profession and its right to establish the standards for its own governance.

In any event, professors have either not fully realized the implications of their professorial status or they have been inhibited in their exercise by governing boards. Trustees have become so much a part of the landscape of higher education that faculties have long since ceased to fight their very existence. But faculty members, now joined by students, seek to wrest from trustees any traces of academic power which they possess or claim. The demands of the faculty and now of the students are not stated in any precise way partly because the role, function, and power of the trustees have never been very accurately stated beyond the oversimplified distinction that the institutional purposes are to be established by the governing board and the academic objectives by the faculty.

With this background in mind let us review the Canadian experience and its implications for American higher education. The Duff-Berdahl Report states bluntly that a "business corporation none of whose directors had ever taken an active part in the work of the corporation would command little confidence. And that is true of most university boards." The Report refuses to allow the logical thrust of this indictment since it firmly rejects the Oxford and Cambridge model, which it describes as a system "with apparently absolute powers of self-government by the academics." The Report does not actually make a very strong case against the Oxford-Cambridge model or some variant of it. The arguments presented by the authors might be developed but, as presented, would not impress those American faculty members (whose number may well be increasing) who are so disenchanted with the self-perpetuating bureaucracy of the governing boards that they more and more would like to have a real revolution in the governance of universities.

In Canada and in America, moreover, the trustees of private universities have apparently failed to accomplish the one function conceded to them by everyone, namely, the raising of sufficient money to carry out the purposes of the private university. Despite the efforts of dedicated trustees, even the wealthiest of America's private universities are finding it difficult or impossible to keep pace with publicly financed universities. Nor have the trustees of private universities been successful in influencing public opinion to acknowledge the need for massive federal support of all universities.

The Duff-Berdahl Report recommends a change which at least a few American universities have adopted recently: the diversification of trustees and the consequent choice of fewer businessmen and lawyers. Such a change may well be desirable. It would be good to have "scientists, writers, and men of mark in any of the arts" on the boards of governors, but they are not likely to be able to assist in acquiring financial resources for a private university. They would, however, offset a bit of that scorn which many students today have for industrialists and businessmen.

A pressing problem for American universities is the recruitment for their boards of members of minority and ethnic groups now almost completely unrepresented. The exclusion of members of these groups has been another manifestation of racism, the enormous consequences of which we are only now beginning to experience.

The Duff-Berdahl Report urges more interaction between faculty senates and university trustees. It recommends the inclusion of at least three faculty members on the ultimate governing board--a device profitably used in Great Britain and most Commonwealth nations. These faculty members would be elected by the elected members of the senate.

Although the concept of faculty participation on boards of trustees is almost unknown in America, it is an idea with considerable promise. The isolation of trustees from faculty members clearly gives rise to that unspoken mutual indifference and even hostility with which trustees and faculty members regard each other. On the other hand the election of professors on the board of trustees might result in a situation where the trustees would feel that any judgment on their part opposed to the view of their fellow trustees who are professors would be an infringement on the academic powers of the faculty.

The Report advocates the continuation of alumni being selected for the boards of trustees. It is surely an anomaly that in some of the best universities in America the alumni can elect one or more of their members but that the faculty does not enjoy the same privilege. The Duff-Berdahl suggestion that only a representative of the students and not an actual student serve on the board might well appear to students (and to others) as inconsistent with the recommendation that alumni continue to be trustees.

The Duff-Berdahl study did not, of course, pretend to be a definitive analysis of the role and function of trustees. But the conclusions of the document leave one of the central questions in Canadian and American higher education unanswered: how precisely can university trustees define and spell out the institutional purposes of a university without colliding head on with the academic purposes and planning of the faculty?

The Report expresses all types and forms of compassion for the president of the university, who often is afflicted with misunderstandings both on the part of the senate and the board of trustees. In all candor, however, the Report does not make it very clear how, if all its recommendations were followed, the president's lot would be very much happier.

The vision and ideal set forth in Paul Goodman's book The Community of Scholars receives little support in the Duff-Berdahl Report. The authors have the right to reject the possibility and desirability of the self-contained university but the Duff-Berdahl document does not appear to confront the real arguments in favor of the ideal of what student power has renamed the "community of scholars and students." The Report offers "shared power" to the faculty but the nature of the power and the extent of the sharing remain amorphous.

In addition, the Duff-Berdahl plan seems to suggest that some faculty members will always seek for more sharing in the power structure. Ignoring the possible merits of the ideas behind this group, the Duff-Berdahl document states that if "a minority of academics continue to harass the administration after the structure of government has been modified toward greater faculty participation, it will be up to the responsible staff to counter these obstructionists and to permit the duly chosen leaders to get on with the difficult task of governing the university." At no point is it conceded that trustees can and do harass faculty members and that they too can be obstructionists.

The Report assumes that faculty members should share in decision making but nowhere does the document really give a satisfactory set of reasons to back its claim that faculty members do not have the right to make decisions about fiscal matters, even though these may be in reality inseparable from academic questions.

The Duff-Berdahl thesis is that a change in the structure of universities will bring about a team of trustees, administrators, and faculty who can, in a spirit of cooperation and continual communication, bring about an ongoing university. This may be so for Canada. It may be so for American universities by and large. But can cooperation and communication substitute in the long run for the ideal which the academic profession cherishes of being self-governing and of planning a true community of scholars? And can a plea for interaction between governing boards and faculty senates hide the fact for very long that outside boards of businessmen are a foreign element in the life of a university?

Information available since the Duff-Berdahl Report indicates that Canada has made more progress in bringing students into the decision-making process of the university than America has. In this respect Canadian universities have moved far beyond the recommendations of the Report.

Because the Report was issued before the great revolt of students in 1968, its authors can perhaps be forgiven because they--like most of us--were unaware of the depths of student alienation and the profound potential of that alienation to disrupt a university. In view of the eruptions of student power, the Duff-Berdahl document is to some extent almost ancient history.

What do students want? It seems clear that students have taken the initiative, that they have in some places gained the ascendancy, and that they may well become the prime movers in the reform of the governance of universities. One can only hope that the Report is correct when it assumes that it is still possible to direct student indignation into channels where "it can flow constructively." Only time will tell whether student anger and alienation are capable of being "channeled" into the existing structure of American and Canadian universities.

MR. MONAHAN MAKES A REJOINDER TO FATHER DRINAN

I share a number of Father Drinan's criticisms of the Duff-Berdahl Report, particularly those affecting the students, though (like him) I find it easy to be wise after the event, so much more so when the events have been as tumultuous as some of the recent student "happenings." However, I think that his understanding of the Report needs correction on one or two points.

Father Drinan criticizes the Report for rejecting the Oxbridge model of faculty self-government, arguing that Duff and Berdahl fail to follow their own logic and that they make a weak case for their rejection. I think he is mistaken on both counts, perhaps because he does not fully appreciate a cardinal point--the Duff-Berdahl Report deals with public institutions deriving a large portion of their finances directly from the public purse, not with private ones.

Duff and Berdahl reject any model of university government involving complete faculty self-government because, in their view, it is less likely that the public interest will be well served. They judge it probable that the public interest as defined by a completely autonomous faculty would differ significantly from that propounded by a governing body with outside membership on it. They are firmly convinced that, "In one form or another the public interest must be enabled to make itself heard and respected by all universities." Of course, their position is arguable; but it is (I think) both consistent and cogent. Whether it applies equally well to private U. S. institutions is another matter.

Faculty membership on the board is another aspect of the Duff-Berdahl Report, the real significance of which I think Father Drinan underestimates. He acknowledges that the recommendation to seat faculty on the board of trustees has considerable merit. Yet he expresses concern that such faculty presence might serve to intensify board-faculty hostility or that it might tend to inhibit trustees in opposing "the spokesmen of the faculty" lest this infringe upon the academic powers of the faculty.

On this one my criticism of Father Drinan moves in the opposite direction. I think that his concern, which implies an adversary relationship between lay board and faculty extending to the respective representatives on a board, is largely groundless. Quite simply, this is not what happens. Those who speculate about the consequences of placing faculty on board frequently find themselves reaching tentative conclusions of this sort; but those who have experienced faculty participation on boards discover that such undesirable consequences seldom eventuate. Far from polarizing attitudes and hardening positions, faculty membership on board usually produces precisely the opposite results, thereby giving the lie to the old saw about familiarity breeding contempt.

Commonly, both faculty and lay members of the board come to regard one another with new respect. Faculty are not regarded as spokesmen for a specific interest group but as knowledgeable members of the university; lay members are not regarded as foreign elements in the university but as persons with particular expertise and viewpoints of value to the university. Moreover, faculty on the board often become valuable allies of the president, helping him in discussions of academic matters with lay board members, and thereby improving in a substantial way the lot of the president. In other ways as well the Report recommends that the president share his responsibilities, thereby reducing the pressures on him.

Finally, I wish to emphasize again that the Duff-Berdahl Report does not present an ideal model of a contemporary university governance. It is a much more modest document, and a much more pragmatic one. The reforms it recommends are practical

ones, and are seen to be practical ones--a most significant factor (I think) in explaining the rapid acceptance of the Report. The Report can be criticized for not going far enough; it has been so criticized and will continue to be. However, with very few exceptions, Canadian universities have undertaken to implement the major recommendations of the Report; and this is no mean accomplishment. In reforming university government in Canada, we have not moved either as far or as fast as some of us might have wished. But there is no denying that we have moved and moved in the right direction. The Duff-Berdahl Report has been a major factor in producing this movement.

FATHER DRINAN, HAVING READ THE REJOINDER,
RESTS HIS CASE WITH HIS ORIGINAL PRESENTATION.

I

RESPONSE TO MR. MONAHAN AND FATHER DRINAN

Keith Spalding
President
Franklin and Marshall College

For those who wish to think further on the community, collegial nature of governance in institutions of higher education, I can recommend the following: (1) the monograph of Dr. J. Douglas Brown of Princeton University entitled Organization and Executive Leadership in a Liberal University; (2) the Joint Statement of the AAUP, AGB, and ACE on government of colleges and universities, published in the Winter 1966 issue of the AAUP Journal; (3) the report of the Campus Governance Project, published under the auspices of the American Association for Higher Education; (4) the Duff-Berdahl Report itself; and (5) the book Governance in Colleges and Universities by John J. Corson.

There is nothing wispy or sentimental in the concepts of community, sharing of responsibility, or collegiality in the government of colleges and universities. The subject is government, not management. The new ideas of governance on a campus have a philosophical base, but they also show a stubbornness, suggesting that colleges and universities serve as models of democracy worthy of emulation by other institutions of society. The concepts of shared authority, as practiced in modern colleges and universities, are in part reflections of trends and developments in other aspects of society--notably in industry. It must not be forgotten, by the way, that some of the most radical concepts in society today are being expressed by industrial and corporate leaders. They are involved, as government is involved, in the decentralization of authority to put the active authority nearest to the scene of the action.

But in colleges and universities it has been necessary to find some centripetal force other than the president and the dean, and it has been determined that the most satisfying and satisfactory governance is not done in adversary style.

It must be admitted that the adversary confrontation is easier. It is easier for the administrators to adopt the attitude that they are employers and the faculty are employees, and even to engage in collective bargaining. But this is a limited approach and often one-dimensional. It does not involve professionals in the decisions that must be made in a community of professionals.

It is for this reason that colleges and universities with foresight have adopted the concepts of shared authority, of dealing with aggregate issues, of plural initiatives, of community in which the college is a cockpit of discourse, but one where reason prevails.

All of this is evidence that colleges and universities are seeking a style of dynamic activity which has as its base the furtherance of education.

Thus, I maintain, these approaches are more radical than those which are based simply on the rhetoric of radicalism.

To our friends in the junior colleges, I would note that their professional future is at stake. I share with others a deep fear that by taking the easy route, they may deny themselves the opportunity to stand in the continuum of education as a part of higher education.

In this connection, I must permit myself a cynical comment: the development of higher education has been responsive to the availability of finances as well as to pressures. I would suggest, however, that we have just gone through our salad days and also that we may be permitted to watch the restructuring of rationalizations as those resources and those pressures are diminished.

It can be almost certainly predicted that in the present context, along with the pressures and preoccupations with finances, there is a parallel thrust--the reorganizing, revitalizing, and redirecting of the efforts of boards of trustees.

This certainly is designed to complicate the lives of presidents. It makes their burdens of leadership much greater. And while I can, on behalf of my fellow presidents, welcome the sympathy that is expressed for them in the Duff-Berdahl Report, they have a solemn responsibility to serve as the conscience of the corporate body of the college and thus to express a form of leadership for the faculty, the students, the trustees--and yes, for the ever-present alumni.

The developments which are in opposition to the collegial approach affect our national scene by diminishing the diversity which has been our strength. It is certain that colleges must take initiatives. I would plead that they not be reactive to these preoccupations and pressures.

II

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: A RENDERING OF ACCOUNTS

Lewis B. Mayhew
Professor of Education
Stanford University
and
President, American Association for Higher Education

At the acme of success, American higher education stands on the verge of imminent impotency unless new ways of dealing with restless students are discovered.

In a nation whose form, structure, and ideology are rationalistic, optimistic, and rooted in a belief in the perfectability of man, pure nihilism has been elevated to one of the prevailing styles of thought. Much of student rhetoric echoes Nietzsche's belief that the will to power begets nihilism. If man becomes the master of his

planet, then his universe, then galaxy, then what? Power for power's sake, no matter how far extended, leaves the dread of a void. Nihilism seems the only possible response to that void since God is dead, God in the sense of a supersensible reality. Hear the overtones in excerpts from the Port Huron statement of the Students for a Democratic Society: "Our work is guided by the sense that we may be the last generation in the experiment with living.... Beneath is the pervading feeling that there simply are no alternatives, that our times have witnessed the exhaustion not only of utopias, but of any new departures as well. Feeling the press of complexity upon the emptiness of life, people are fearful of the thought that at any moment things might thrust out of control...."

At a time when more and more of the nation's youth are led to aspire to higher education, the most revered institutions are respected for limiting access and for encouraging professors to eliminate concern for students as a viable or desirable ethic. In prestige institutions undergraduate students are tolerated as a financial base, for the support of professors' real work, or they are looked upon as a large source from which a few new recruits for the priesthood of scholarship may be chosen. The university, traditionally regarded as the focus of the creative energies of the society, thus seeks to alienate itself from those society wishes served, and in some of the most highly financed and selective institutions seems determined to alienate itself from all other professions and callings. The preparation of future scholars is judged of infinitely greater worth than the preparation of those who would practice in the service of man.

Although apologists for higher education have canonized its role as critic of society, free from the political restraints placed on other institutions and offices, it is rapidly becoming an object of political concern partly through its own artlessness and partly through the efforts of nihilistic youth. States, private donors, and parents have been persuaded to support colleges and universities to do as they please. But the bills have become so large and the evidence of social utility so lacking that a rendering of accounts, long overdue, is likely to be demanded by political forces. These forces are strengthened in their resolve by the phenomenal intensification of student unrest, which has on some campuses resulted in a direct challenge of the conventional wisdom.

The combined influence of continued student protest and disorder in urban streets will at least bring greater political scrutiny of the operations of colleges and universities, but more than that it could generate a conservative or even fascist government to preserve order even at the expense--or especially at the expense--of law. Make no mistake about this. Students occupying administration buildings, conducting pagan happenings, or stressing the erotic in plays and publications are directly responsible for cuts in educational appropriations, investigations of academic operations, and overruling by political authorities of decisions and prerogatives of academic administrators.

The power of a rampant nihilism encountering entrenched syndicalism of professors within a society of frightened and vengeful people could polarize the society in any of several directions. Youthful intellectuals allied with the poor could confront the establishment as did a similar alliance in France in 1789. One wonders what the twentieth century version of the guillotine would be. Or, youthful intellectuals and their not so youthful mentors who decry growing up absurd could force themselves into a cul de sac rejecting society and denying it their very considerable talents. Or, the nihilism of youth could so spread

to other segments of society that an atomic resolution of the bleak uncertainties of an age would seem a welcome respite. Of course there is always the counterrevolution standing in the wings with its powers of legitimacy and appeal to ordered convention.

But a more creative stance with regard to the conflict confusing campuses would be to seek a resolution that would accommodate realities and preserve educational energies for the benefit of society. Such a stance would necessitate a thorough diagnosis to determine whether the malaise of higher education is terminally malignant or benign. Since higher education is organically related to the rest of society, it too eventually must be scrutinized; but for a beginning some of the roots of dissent within education may be exposed.

Institutions are captives of their histories and nowhere is this more apparent than in dealings with students. The American college placed considerable power in the hands of its president both to maintain the institution and to mold and shape students, exercising in the process the same prerogatives the law allowed a parent or a master of a slave. A president could dismiss a student from school the day of graduation, could search students' rooms, could punish by lowering grades for crimes against a community, or make students answerable to the college for acts committed far from the campus and even while under parental jurisdiction. Too many institutions, through their leaders, act as though they still really had the power of a colonial president and that students have no procedural rights or rights to due process. Thus, one president denies students of an entire class a traditional induction into the next class because several students stood nude before the windows of their own rooms. Another dean cancels, without consultation with students, their time-honored right to assemble in a space next to the campus. Still another official acts to suppress an article proposed for a student magazine, while another suspends a student for alleged violations of college rules but without a hearing. Now many such actions would make sense to outraged adults but are indefensible in the light of the American judicial tradition. Hence one angry reaction on the part of a university official to vexing problems of students provides the legitimate focus for many not so legitimate student protests. Virtually every major student uprising was made possible because at some point some college official made the institution vulnerable through denying generally recognized procedural rights. Behind every successful student outbreak stands some administrator who exercised discretion without legitimacy.

Institutions have been unable to take and maintain a strong moral stand against student destruction of property or violation of the rights of others partly because their own moral position was assailable--and bright militant students quickly recognize tarnished values. Thus, lurking in the background of presidential recanting in confrontations with students stand examples of arbitrary action, double standards, and even some examples of dishonesty. The dean of students who denies a white girl the right to bring a Negro date to a dance in the 1960's is not really in a position to face militant students sitting in an administration building in protest over Dow recruiters on the campus, even granted that the student technique and concern were inappropriate to the mission of the university. The institution, which through unconcerned operation of its recruitment policies, allows itself to become "lily white" is not really in a position to dispute charges that its athletics department had practiced racism. Or, the institution which acts out of anger or petulance in dealing with a difficult faculty member in violation of the spirit if not the law regarding tenure and the like can scarcely confront students who similarly violate the spirit if not the law of a collegiate community.

Of a different order is the failure of institutions to recognize that in many respects college students represent a new kind of adolescence requiring a special

kind of response. Within American middle class society there has always been some disjunction between various adult statuses and adult functions. One can drive at 16, kill at 18, and drink at 21--all adult statuses--but still not function as an adult in the sense of economic self-sufficiency until 25. In the past the biology, status, and function of adulthood were achieved within a relatively short span of time. Puberty would come at 14 or 16, end of schooling at 16 or 18, marriage at 19 or 20, franchise at 21, and a full-time job at about the same time. Now, however, the time span of incomplete adulthood has been extended from perhaps five years to ten or fifteen years. Thus, the contemporary university is faced with finding ways of dealing with large numbers of students who have achieved biological adulthood and many of the statuses of adulthood, yet who cannot really be responsible for themselves, mates, children, or society in any save limited ways. Until the present, the attempt was made to deal with these students in ways similar to those appropriate for adolescence with fewer of the attributes of adulthood. And, of course, it doesn't work. Some of the struggles of college students in their middle twenties to obtain a share in the governance of a college may in reality be an effort to simulate a part of adulthood which their economic condition denies them. In earlier times, a twenty-five-year-old man was responsible for himself and family and felt responsible for a part of society. The modern twenty-five-year-old college student probably labors with considerable guilt because he is not similarly placed; hence his drive to campus power sublimates guilt.

There are, of course, a number of other explanations or hypotheses as to why students, especially the restless or militant ones, seek confrontations. At least two factors must be mentioned. The first is the general affluence of middle class white America existing as it does beside a tradition rooted in Calvinism and the rejection of pleasure. Somehow both adults and students in American colleges display considerable guilt over never having it so good, with restless students opting for the poverty of dropping out and faculty opting for extending the work day and week into times once reserved for recreation as a means of alleviating guilt. Somehow the student who can wear old clothes, eat simple fare, and scorn the "fat cats" eases the guilt which comes from knowing he has had a life of luxury. Equally the professor who flies at night to avoid losing a day of work and who carries his own work into the weekends is coping with the problems of affluence.

This problem of affluence is intensified by the twin issues of the plight of minority groups in America and the war now in Vietnam but who can tell where next? With respect to the war, there is more than a small suspicion that at least part of present affluence is war-based. Hence to enjoy affluence is to condone a war the justice of which is in considerable doubt. In a very real sense the protesting college student may be covering the guilt he feels because he knows had his parents not been war-based affluent, he might be fighting the war instead of in college. Police billy clubs are still safer than Viet grenades and he knows it and feels guilty about it. Of course, the moral dilemma of affluent America over the plight of the Negro is the most divisive force in the society. The guilt and grief which white America evidenced on the death of Martin Luther King is illustrative of the subterranean feeling there before his death. It is no accident that the student protests derived from the civil rights movement. When it ceased to attract, other protest activity could be used to sublimate the guilt stemming from three hundred years of injustice.

If this analysis has even limited validity, then some possible solutions to the problems dealing with restless students are suggested. The first is really just a palliative, although a not insignificant one. It is to put the problem in some kind of historical perspective. Students have always been difficult

to live with and have frequently assumed postures which bothered adults and disturbed institutions. Medieval students rioted, dumped garbage on passersby, wrote ribald poems and read them on church steps, coerced their professors, and occasionally killed one. Colonial students rioted about food, stole, took pot shots at university presidents, protested infringement of their private lives, and gradually forced colleges to modify stringent rules regarding personal conduct. Nineteenth century students took sides over the Civil War and demanded a voice in academic governance. Twentieth century students signed the Oxford Peace Pledge, joined in the Spanish Civil War, rioted over food, violated the 18th Amendment, and experimented with sex. There is probably good reason to believe that the present wave of student unrest may be qualitatively different from those earlier times. However, at least an important portion of student protest replicates those of the past simply because the process of growing up really has not changed much in quite a few years. If somehow the embattled administrator could with some humor reflect on the past, and perhaps even learn from the past, his feelings if not his plight might be helped. Students, when they have protested, have on occasion been trying to say something. Student riots over the quality of food in the commons and the subsequent organization of fraternities and eating clubs were real responses to bad conditions. Student agitation over strict rules of conduct was sparked by an overzealous desire on the part of faculty to impose a Puritan ideal of conduct which simply could not work in a changing society. Perhaps historical reflection might suggest that old standards can be changed and still the world turns.

But there are other, more direct ways which might be attempted. In virtually every major campus upset since 1964, a lack of procedures and procedural rights was evident--rights which could have kept grievances within legitimate bounds. The technique of direct administrative handling of disciplinary matters has lost its legitimacy in the eyes of students and of many faculty members, and this should be recognized and changes made. First, there should be only a limited number of offenses over which the university has jurisdiction. This would include such academic offenses as cheating and plagiarism and such violations as misusing equipment, damage to university property, or interference with the legitimate rights of others to use institutional facilities. These, codified, should then be the responsibility of a campus judicial system with procedures for indictments, hearings, and appeals made explicit. As a general rule, no administrator should have the right to assess guilt or to assign punishment; nor should he have the right to make administrative rulings without the option of a review both of policy and specific substance. Also generally, the campus judicial body should be elected from faculty, students, and administration; but administrative officers charged with administering regulations concerning conduct should be barred from membership and even presence during deliberations. Very likely this campus judicial body might have original jurisdiction over offenses regarding the code of behavior and an appeals function for major controversy over other matters. For example, if a student editor and faculty advisor disagree over whether an item should be published and the campus editorial board cannot resolve the matter, appeal to the campus judicial body should be an option with its ruling final unless overturned by the institution's board of trustees. Within such a structure even the most vexing of campus issues could be resolved without placing the administration in a vulnerable position. Student sit-ins on university property, obstruction of on-campus recruitment, and destruction of university property could all be handled if the campus judicial body is allowed to act responsibly.

Then, too, institutions ought to be more parsimonious in their claimed objectives. Colleges and universities are not churches, clinics, or even parents. They are devices by which a limited number of skills, insights, and points of view are communicated to the young. The means for achieving these limited goals are many

and varied. Residence halls, lectures, participation in faculty committees and discussions, libraries, and laboratories are properly viewed as techniques of instruction and should be used in a professional manner much as the medical profession uses X rays, medicine, or splints. University regulation of the professional uses of its resources seems quite appropriate; and if use were so limited, few students could legitimately protest. Setting library or laboratory hours and safety requirements for residence halls, or requiring conditions of quiet in classrooms or lecture halls don't seem to become issues in campus controversy except when drawn in the wake of a more central issue. But when the institution claims too much, it becomes suspect. And when an institution attempts to regulate beyond what is necessary to achieve its limited educational goals, it becomes vulnerable. Whether or not a student burns his draft card, participates in a civil rights march, engages in premarital or extramarital sexual activity, becomes pregnant, attends church, sleeps all day, or drinks all night is not really the responsibility of a collegiate institution. This is not to say that such matters may not be of concern to an institution or that it cannot deal with them. But if they are of concern, it should be an educational--even a curricular one. Instruction in sex hygiene, ethics, law, or health is appropriate. Requiring a specific kind of behavior is no more appropriate than a requirement that all who finish a course in American government vote Democratic.

An even more significant reform involves the assertation of administrative prerogative in relevant domains. For better or for worse, American higher education is and has been administrator-centered. It is the president or central administration which brings about innovation when it does happen. It is the president or administrator whose goals are closest to those of students who want a better education. Actually the militant students who want to join with the faculty are in a sense allying themselves to the greatest danger, for it is the American college faculty which has so professionalized itself that it can disregard demands from its clients--the students. And it is the president who, if he errs, brings about confrontation and on occasion collapse. In each of the most widely publicized campus upheavals it was administrative failure which led to trouble. Administrative failure in the sense that the chief executive or an associate used his powers on inappropriate problems.

The president should have control of the finances of the institution, certain veto powers, certain appointive powers, and, of course, the powers which attend possession of information. These he is expected to use in the exercise of educational leadership but in procedurally established ways and in the light of other powers belonging to other campus elements. The faculty quite properly should have control over the curriculum, its own membership, and the conditions of student entrance and exit. Students should have the power of self-determination over their private lives and the conduct of their own group living but with a number of procedural rights guaranteed. To illustrate how these powers might operate in potentially controversial situations, several examples are suggested. A president should have a voice in faculty appointment and tenure because of the financial commitment. A president should not be able to decree a new program, for that is the concern of the faculty; but he should be able to determine whether or not it will be financed. A president should not have the power to expel a student for misconduct but should have the power to veto a decision of the campus judicial body and the obligation to refer the matter to the board of trustees.

What all this adds up to is a formulation involving delegation of powers and authority, the establishment of procedures and due process, and a concern for a limited number of purposes and objectives. It is a tight constructionist interpretation based on the belief that loose constructionism has really brought about the crisis-confrontations. If college officials concern themselves with defensibly educational matters through use of clearly defined powers and recognized procedures, order may yet be restored and accounts finally settled.

II

RESPONSE TO MR. MAYHEW

Lon Williams
President, Umphrey Lee Student Center
Southern Methodist University

Mr.Mayhew states that the delegation of powers and authority, the establishment of procedures and due process, and a concern for a limited number of purposes and objectives is the formula to be used in deterring insurrections among students.

That such a definition of powers and responsibilities is not thought necessary by the whole of the academic world is appalling to the concerned student of today. The universities of yesterday were as much training centers for morals and behavior as they were for calculus and biology. Unfortunately, today's universities have not noted the changes in the average ages which are approximately 18 to 22. They still insist that denying a twenty-two-year-old man the right to consume alcoholic beverage because the university considers it undesirable and giving him no opportunity for self-determination is necessary to protect the student from himself.

All the responsible student requests is that he be given a means to participate significantly in the processes which affect him as a student of the university and as an adult in the community. Generally, the student does not want complete independence in conducting his affairs; but when he observes that procedures are not even present which would allow him to exist as someone other than a child, he becomes frustrated and strikes out as a child--violently.

As the university establishes due processes to replace the older system, consultation with the students is mandatory. This is for the universities' good as well as the students'. Considerable time and effort can be saved from working on an impractical program by simply asking students' opinions. Nobody thinks as a twenty-one-year-old except a twenty-one-year-old. The end product should be one that is palatable to the university and agreeable to the student.

Once guidelines are drawn, the university is often tested to see if it is actually sincere in its efforts to clean house. This is hardly surprising since often the university uses its student involvement in procedures as advertising in trying to obtain the best students. The best students come and often are rudely shocked to learn that the standards and procedures only apply at the administration's discretion. This hypocrisy can be the spark which ignites a volatile situation. Students particularly do not like to be intentionally misled and are more likely than any other group to take some action to correct the problem. Therefore, the consultation of responsible students in the discussions preceding the establishment of rules and regulations is extremely important.

Mr. Mayhew is quite correct in concluding that his solution is a solution to the unrest on campuses. He never mentions how nihilistic students are to be reasoned

with. It is very difficult to determine what percentage of rebellions are held only for the sake of rebellion, with reason and common sense absent. But surely a portion of the students do have destruction as a forethought. It is indeed sad that a solution for this phase of the problem is not available, because it could very well be the most urgent of the dilemmas.

The person who devises a theory that can reason with the unreasonable and govern the ungovernable indeed deserves the praise of the secular and academic worlds together.

III

GOVERNANCE AND RELEVANCE FOR THOSE OVER THIRTY

Harold L. Hodgkinson
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley

Let me begin with a comment in response to a remark Mr. Mayhew made. I feel that it is extremely important that college administrators not put students on major committees simply in order to cool down student unrest. It must be done primarily out of a feeling that for this campus at this time it is right to have students engaged in the governing processes. To include students in committee structures which are ineffectual and virtually powerless is often to increase student resentment rather than to decrease it. I am in favor of having students participate in university governance, but not at the expense of the rather cynical motivations which often seem to be involved in getting them there.

When we look at governance, we are tempted to look at the yes-no decisions which are made and assume that that is what governance is. The feeling of the Campus Governance Project is that governance is far more. It involves human beings in all of the complexities and ambiguities of interpersonal relationships.

One of the initial impressions that I had of the seventeen campuses we visited concerns their myth of uniqueness. It seems to me that more than any other educational perspective, this uniqueness retards institutional change, and makes it difficult if not impossible for some institutions to learn from others. One could hear very often, "Oh, yes, it's very interesting what they're doing, but of course it doesn't apply to us." One can see the possibility of twenty-four-hundred institutions each going through a very painful metamorphosis because of the inability of one institution to learn from another.

The uniqueness, however, does not result in behavioral differences of individuals on different campuses. There seems to be remarkable commonality of status systems in American higher education. The best way to describe this system is to call it "higher education--the higher the better." Thus, increasing faculty demands for more specialized teaching and (particularly) research commitments are a component of the aspirations and expectations of most campuses regardless of protestations that X is a teaching institution.

One of the major elements of the uniqueness usually professed concerns a particular ideology which the campus supposedly subscribes to. One example is the protective ideology--that the nature of the college is primarily to protect its

young charges from the evils of society. On many campuses there seems to be an age phenomenon here: the more mature faculty members and administrators tend to believe in this protective ideology, whereas it's virtually meaningless for younger faculty and students. There are, however, some students for whom the protective ideology seems to be functional, in that they need this security in order to develop new intellectual and social interests. It may be too easy just to cry "down with protective institutions," as they do fulfill a legitimate function in terms of student growth and potential, although other students may find them terribly frustrating.

It also seems that some administrators on protective campuses are looking the other way with regard to student behavior. There is one example of a dean of women who is concerned entirely with student dress, feeling that if she can keep shorts out of the social rooms, she has done her job. On this particular campus there is a great deal of open sex, alcohol, and drug usage. Clearly, the protective rhetoric has not adapted enough to take account of current social conditions. The administration seems to be fully accountable for what happens on campus; yet it is often not very influential. Faculty members, on the other hand, seem often to be in the situation of virtually total influence with relatively little accountability for what goes on.

It is very difficult to speak of relevance with regard to junior college faculty members. In some cases the campuses are too new to have developed any kind of ideology. Some faculty have adopted the monolithic standard of specialization in effete research which seems to be common in higher education, while many others seem to have adopted a very genuine service motive. It does seem to make a difference whether the teacher is moving "up" from high school or "down" from a four-year college. One would expect in this sort of an exceedingly fluid situation to find a desire for security in the faculties' initiation of governance procedures, and this seems to be the case.

The value conflict between teaching and research seems a clear part of the relevance problem for institutions in general, but younger faculties seem to have particular problems. Even if the campus ideology stresses teaching, there is usually a cadre of young faculty members who see research as <u>the</u> means of institutional mobility, of making the place a "better institution." Certainly, the tenet that young equals academic liberal (in favor of change in curriculum and teaching) and old equals academic conservative (in favor of no change), does <u>not</u> hold up. On some campuses the young faculty seem far more unwilling to consider change than the older faculty. I would like to suggest that we give up usage of liberal and conservative in this regard, and speak instead of open and closed attitudes with regard to change.

In a few instances the president still defines what relevance is to mean for that campus, and people listen. But these are few, and the trends seem to be against this development. This new kind of nonmonarchical administration is still quite poorly defined, as Sir Eric Ashby has said, "The textbooks on industrial management or public administration...don't help us much for they make one basic assumption which is repugnant to the whole spirit of science and scholarship--namely, that policy originates at the top and travels downwards." Administrators of higher learning have to grope their way in darkness toward the principles of their profession. Clearly, the earlier "leader" view was characteristic of a "tall" organization, and the newer mediator role is characteristic of a "flat organization" in which people tend to be at parity with one another rather than one person being "over" another.

With regard to relevance in operation, very few people in our institutions were concerned with problems of the college or university as a whole. There is a strong self-interest tendency in the responses of students and faculty to our preinterview

questionnaire. On the first factor dealing with institutional resources, students considered student parking to be the primary problem. They considered faculty and staff parking facilities eighth, whereas faculty considered it the third most important problem. Sabbatical leave policies were considered the second most important resource problem by the faculty, whereas the students considered it fourteenth. The administrators emerge as being slightly less self-interested, as their first concern was for faculty office space, their second concern was for student parking, and their third concern was with faculty and staff parking. The fourth most important administrative problem was seen as administrative office space, which was ranked eleventh by the faculty and thirteenth by the students. With this much discrepancy between groups on the importance of various problems, it is somewhat explainable that there is so little concern with institution-wide problems, as most are too busy with problems of their own house.

Few, if any, of our campuses had <u>effective</u> communication networks whereby others could be concerned with the problems of a particular group. Almost no situations allowed for what I would call an <u>affective</u> communication network which would make it possible for people's feelings and emotions to be communicated to others. In fact, the interoffice memo seems designed intentionally to eliminate any chance for human feeling to be communicated. We also found that with all the complaints we heard from administrators about the lack of interest in institutional-wide problems, there also was very little information available on institution-wide problems whereby people could think meaningfully about them. (For example, information about the budget is often very difficult for students or faculty to acquire; and it therefore seems silly for administrators to request that faculty and students consider this, if information is not freely available.)

Faculty governance seems to be in trouble on many campuses due to a lack of relevance to the needs and interests of a large portion of the faculty. There also is a strange pervasiveness in the professional faculty point of view that governance is menial, and is really beneath the talents of professional faculty. On the other hand, when the suggestion is made that if faculty find this sort of work too difficult, it could be handed over to somebody else, one frequently hears anguished cries that only the faculty can make all of the governance decisions. Long-range planning of an academic nature on most campuses is not successful in that faculty do not seem to be able to perform this incredibly difficult task. One obvious reason is that it takes too much time and too much knowledge of the entire university academic structure for faculty to do well at this job. But because faculty will not allow board members, or students, or administrators to get into the academic planning act, no one else gets a chance to try. The result of this is that frequently long-range planning on most campuses is a brick-and-mortar affair.

Some faculty members, as a matter of fact, have even developed a cult of irrationality with regard to governance. As a way of upgrading the professional work of teachers and researchers, college faculty often feel that they must denigrate the administrative or governance functions. Administrators, however, tend not to have too many identity problems as the system defines who they are to a considerable degree. But faculty members on many campuses seem to be having an identity crisis of some magnitude. Two of the major components of this are feelings of guilt for the neglect of teaching, particularly undergraduates; and second, they often find themselves doing rather boring research which they are not interested in. Some of them simply had to get additional grants in order to keep their status within the department, but find that the work is unprofitable and dull.

Relatively few faculty members in our sample could be called members of the "jet set" professoriate, although we found some. But students seem to get around the country in an amazing fashion. They seem to know far more than faculty members what's going on in higher education. For example, on one of our campuses in which the student body has worked very had to establish a really energetic and lively experimental college nationally known, the faculty are almost totally ignorant of what is going on. It was an activity which some said was simply "not worth their time."

Another governance problem which seems widespread is that of the landlocked dean who must be everybody's man--the president's man, the faculty's man, the student's man, and even the board of trustee's man. As a consequence, he tends to be nobody's man. On some larger campuses, the department has effectively controlled virtually all academic decision making, thereby defining the dean or academic vice president out of the action. In fact, if I were a student agitator looking for a good place to get to work, I think my eye would come to rest on the department chairman. Departments are highly bureaucratized, specialized, and full of trained incapacity. They also tend to be relatively strong on a depersonalized view of the student. The department chairman (faculty-administrators in our sample) often played a rather interesting link-pin communication function. It would appear, however, that in order to fulfill this function of communication across the faculty-administration gap, they had to be considered as "safe" by both sides. Thus, department chairmen who serve this communication function may be less capable of getting things done and initiating new programs just because they <u>are</u> considered "safe."

One would assume that on a highly factionalist "separation of powers" campus communication between factions would be bad. In point of fact, it often is, but not always. The reason for this may be that if factions have real power, this will result in a respect of factions for each other, and a great desire to know what the others are up to. With this kind of motivation, communication often can be highly effective.

With all the talk about student activism, the majority of students on our campuses seemed to plod quietly through, picking up a degree, a husband, or some other trophy, very quietly. If the deans are in the middle, then the students are in the middle of the middle. Most are not involved in any sort of radical action program, although what they are thinking is often hard to determine.

Finally, with regard to leadership, it is very difficult to use this term meaningfully in the analysis of higher education. Most definitions of leadership come from industry with their "tall" or hierarchical organization. We tend to define leadership, if at all, after it's happened rather than before. Leadership clearly has something to do with followership, in that if people are not willing to support a leader, one cannot say that he is leading.

The pattern of faculty mobility moving toward leadership positions tends to be a self-cancelling operation. One becomes a leader within the faculty structure by not offending existing factions. To some extent this seems to be true of administration, also. It is not at all clear whether the mobility hierarchy for faculty members is now moving upward through the ranks of the faculty, and from thence into administrative positions. A large number of faculty <u>say</u> that they will have nothing to do with any administrative job whatsoever, that their interests are those of the philosopher-king, and that metaphor may not be a bad one. It is hard to understand why a full professor, making an excellent salary, should give up his large amount of independent time to consider an administrative deanship or presidency in which he must work in often mundane surroundings for less money per hour than he currently makes. This question of mobility patterns of college faculty members is an interesting

one to pursue, in that this is unquestionably a good potential source of future administrators. One thing that can be said with certainty is that the old definitions of leadership characterized by the "captains of industry" are obsolete, due largely to the increased awareness and feelings of autonomy and sophistication of participants in higher education. If one were to lead in that way today, it is doubtful whether anyone would follow. Or, to paraphrase the famous statement of Satchel Paige, "Don't turn around to see who's following; there might not be anybody there."

III

SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT SELECTED ASPECTS OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION GENERATED BY THE CAMPUS GOVERNANCE PROGRAM

Stephen B. Plumer
Associate Director
AAHE Campus Governance Program
Syracuse, New York

We have been hearing a great deal about student activists and revolutionaries. I would like to comment about the typical student with whom we met and talked during the course of the Campus Governance Program.

This student represents several conflicts. On the one hand he is upwardly mobile and concerned with being and becoming a success. Being a success means passing formal course work, while becoming a success means "making it" in the consumer economy. He has become accustomed to viewing and experiencing formal educational experiences as licensing procedures and as rites of passage necessary to achieve success. He notes that parents and faculty are concerned with outcomes: parents with the achievement of high grades and with the degree; faculty with the students' ability to reproduce specific content in some faculty-predetermined form.

It is not too surprising that the student rejects the adult verbiage about meaningful education as another word game and adopts the code of "Don't rock the boat" as his approach to being and becoming successful. This code requires a chameleon-like response to changing environments and stimuli. To succeed one must "out-psych" the professor. This must be done with the ultimate "put-on" which means that a facade of sincerity must accompany questions. Most of the questions, however, are really requests for conformity prescriptions. Most times we provide the prescription and therefore reinforce the perception of meaningful education as another adult word game.

This typical student has another side to him. He is concerned with social justice and democratic ideals. He has learned to recognize injustice and to identify with the oppressed. He recognizes the discrepancies between the verbalized and operational values of those adults around him, particularly those of his parents.

Concern with safe passage, combined with accurate perceptions of problems, results in a terrible frustration and ambivalence. As a result, these students attack the safe adults, their parents, bitch to each other about their teachers who have pass-fail power, and continue to behave safely in the manner of the adults whom they attack. They also move toward altruistic activities in which they can provide services to those oppressed folks with whom they can identify. They deal with symptoms and services, not with causes and social changes, and again behave in the "Don't rock the boat" tradition.

We talk with one another about needed student change, but at the same time perpetuate through our own behavior two things that these students tell us: first, that their college is not a responsive institution; and second, that the education which we provide is not relevant.

What does responsiveness mean to those concerned but turned-off students when they talk to one another?

They define the responsive college as one which is composed of concerned, interested, and available people who communicate in a clear and open way. The administration should be more interested in individuals than in developing inflexible patterns of course and degree requirements. Effective people help to get things done, they don't generate more red tape. Students say that the main thrust of a responsive college should be to help each student to maximize self-responsibility and to become what he thinks he can be.

Students suggest that such responsiveness is not possible in their colleges because of the lack of common interests and purposes of the staffs of their schools.

Some of our data suggest that the conflicts and discrepancies which the students perceive are real. For example, junior faculty say that senior faculty block curricular reform. They say that promotion and tenure are controlled by the senior group and that to succeed one must meet the acceptable way of doing things. Faculty say that administrators have no business in the academic program. Administrators say that they are concerned with the quality of the educational experience and student-faculty relationships but they give priority to research and publication in promotion and tenure decisions.

Students identify the teaching ability of faculty as their primary concern but faculty and administrators rank this at the bottom of their concerns.

There is a lack of clarity about what administrators, faculty, and students think each other think about them. This difficulty is compounded because of the lack of common information and the willingness to initiate new, open, personal forms of communication. There is a great deal of labeling of people and a predisposition to stereotype and very little effort to clarity and to redefine stereotypic views.

Most of us have not been responsive to the student concern about the lack of responsiveness. We have reacted in an impersonal way. We have talked about the responsive institutions or organizations as if they have a heart and a head of their own. We have not formally recognized the fact that organizations are the net result of "interactions of men with ideas, wills, energies, minds, purposes" and perspectives which they use in a coordinated way as they live and work together. We have denied our <u>own</u> responsibility for the existing situation and have contributed to the myth of the invisible "<u>they</u>" (who in this case is <u>us</u>), and have furthermore contributed to the grand mystique of the conspiracy and the monolithic establishment.

We add to this obfuscation of the student concern by emphasizing the role of the past and the role of tradition in explaining why things are the way they are or why our college is the way it is.

By using the past as a defense for the status quo and a rationale for the need for slow, incremental change, we promote the passive, fatalistic view that we are so confined by our past that we are indeed powerless.

Understanding the past is important but only insofar as our analytic skills allow us to understand the dynamics of the complex relationships which characterize our colleges. It is the application of analytic skills not the worship of the past which is essential for the identification and continuance of worthwhile organizational forms and practices and the reform of others.

It seems to me that we do have the power, the right, and the responsibility to help our students and ourselves to make things better. We might begin by recognizing, as Robert Nisbet said (Commentary, June 1968) that "Events do not marry and have little events that grow into big events which in turn marry and have little events."

Responsive organizations (people) which are past-oriented, by definition would have a difficult time in being relevant to contemporary youth. This becomes particularly clear when we describe what our students define as relevance.

Students say that a relevant situation is one in which behavior is the primary indicator of values. Administrators and faculty need to stop talking about their principles and begin to behave according to them. The message: trust is learned and earned through interaction and not through statements of egalitarianism.

Relevant education defines learning as an active process (participation in a civil rights demonstration) as well as a passive process (hearing a lecture about civil rights demonstrations). They ask us, "What are the guiding assumptions about the ways in which people most effectively teach and learn?" Who defines these? How are they reflected in the organizational structures, staff patterns, teaching practices, academic program, existing working and living conditions, and relationships between and among people?

I also wonder if it is possible for us to provide opportunities for students to learn and to apply analytic approaches to events/experiences which have meaning to them at a given point in time.

Educational relevance also includes opportunities to participate as peers in intellectual inquiry. This does not assume a sameness or peerage of experience, knowledge, or technique but rather an equality of humanness and a common task orientation. The junior members of the group are not relegated to paint-brush washing while the others do the "important work."

Students say that the future may be more important than the past and the present--however, if you don't do anything about the present (aside from talking about it) there may not be a future. The thrust for university involvement may be based on this concern coupled with the need to find an institutionally approved way to deal with perceived social issues.

Finally, students say that relevant education should be a broadening experience, expanding self-consciousness through confrontation with self and others who deal with ideas, facts, and values.

Let's try to understand the struggle which we and our students are having as we try to resolve the ambivalence which we see and feel.

We are living in a society in which the implicit is being made explicit. The following points illustrate this phenomenon: (1) The media are replacing inference and subtlety with vividness and candor. (2) Our society is undergoing

a change in its moral standards and values. The emerging "adulterous society" reflects the fact that youth are not the only ones struggling with these changing value systems. (3) There is general concern with obtaining information about and being able to affect those forces which affect our lives. This is true on all sides of the political spectrum. The Poor Peoples' Campaign, the revolutionary movement among our black brothers, the voting down of school budgets, the reactions to the proposed gun control regulation, and the movement for greater local control of poverty programs are illustrative of this. (4) The "new politics" which exposes public issues through confrontation has resulted in a new awareness of what power means--how it has been used and how it can be used to either maintain the status quo or to initiate social change.

Those of us who were socialized in past generations and entered the academy did not have to adapt or cope with these phenomena. We have been in a relatively protective environment, creating our own society and generating stimuli with which we are comfortable. Academic freedom has been our cause celebre and we have learned to deal with intrusions in this area through our professional associations and acceptable institutional behaviors. We have prided ourselves on the fact that public confrontations are not as effective as private encounters and have used privileged channels of communication to serve well our own self-interests.

It is an oversimplification to say that our institutions are not responsive because they have not yet been modified by contemporary societal forces. We are the ones who have not yet been modified by these forces and who respond quite humanly, if not responsibly and creatively, by striving to do things and to keep things operating within our tradition of effectiveness and comfort.

The result of our cultural lag is that we are constantly frustrated in our efforts to adapt ourselves and our institutional structures to meet contemporary demands. What we call being tactful the students label and regard as being a fake. Confrontation requires the capacity to tell it like it is in a language which no one can misunderstand. It is direct and sometimes harsh but it is most often an accurate account of how a specific situation is perceived and reported by those who are communicating. Our language is far from being direct. For example: "We suggest that there is a possibility that the committee structure might require some revision and tentatively seek your reaction to the proposal that" etc.

Within this context of cultural lag we talk about opportunities for student participation in campus government. We use words like "consultative" and "seeking advice," while the activist students want to know "who has the power" and "what power we will have?" All students recognize that they are outside of the channels of communication and influence. The safe students are willing to become part of the now effective participation since it contributes to their success motif. But they approach it with a sophisticated "put on" of interest and involvement.

We even have trouble accepting these "safe" students because of their different styles of communication and our inability to reach them.

We even have trouble accepting these "safe" students because of their different styles of communication and our inability to reach them.

Our referents--our college experiences, our beliefs, values, perceptions, and response patterns--combined with the pressures which we feel, create an aura of stress which inhibits our capacity to respond in new and different ways.

The patterns of governance in colleges and universities need some critical appraisal and appropriate reform. The recent student activities may have created a panic response which is more concerned with containing students than with dealing with the more basic issues.

If we are to overcome our discomfort and to utilize our desire to survive to create rather than to inhibit, we have to develop new ways of working together.

A first step might be for each of us to take a deep look at ourselves and our behavior in our various roles. Each of us can contribute a new human element toward the reform of our colleges and universities. This new human element may reflect a new language and style of communication which reflects what we think, feel, and believe--a language which is consistent with our behavior.

This new communication will lead to a search for new ways of formalizing our working relationships. These new forms will be based on some common but diverse assumptions about the way in which people learn, grow, and maximize their potential. We will define, experiment, evaluate, redefine, etc. We will refuse to be static or sloppy.

Finally, we will apply our analytic skills to our work environment and will refuse to be seduced by the easy answer and the stereotypic response. In short, we will be responsive to our students and to our society.